

Application No.: 10/074,272  
Amendment and Response dated October 4, 2004  
Reply to Office Action of July 2, 2004  
Docket No.: 1199-4  
Page 6

### **REMARKS**

Claims 54, 55 and 62-90 are currently pending in this application. Claims 1-53 and 56-61 have been cancelled without prejudice. Claims 1-22, 32-50 and 56-61 have been cancelled as the result of an earlier restriction requirement. Applicants retain the right to present claims 1-22, 32-50 and 56-61 in a divisional application. Applicants reserve the right to prosecute claims 23-31 and 51-53 in a continuation application.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration in view of the following remarks.

### **Applicants' Response to Restriction Requirement**

The application is subject to a restriction requirement. The Examiner requires restriction under 35 U.S.C. §121 into the following groups:

- I. Claims 1-22, 37-43, 47-50 and 56-61, drawn to a product (class 424 and sub-class 488);
- II. Claims 23-31 and 51-55, drawn to a process (class 264 and sub-class 175); and
- III. Claim 32-36 and 44-46, drawn to a method (class 424 and sub-class 434).

Applicants elect to prosecute Group II, claims 23-31 and 51-55.

### **Allowable Subject Matter**

Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the Examiner's finding of allowable subject matter. Specifically, claims 54-55 have been allowed.

Applicants have added new claims 62-90 herein, which depend from allowable base claim 54. New claims 62-88 correspond to dependent claims that were present in the originally

Application No.: 10/074,272  
Amendment and Response dated October 4, 2004  
Reply to Office Action of July 2, 2004  
Docket No.: 1199-4  
Page 7

filed application but depended from other independent claims. New claims 89 and 90 are supported by the specification as filed on pages 5, 9, 11 and 28.

**Applicants' Response to 35 U.S.C. §102 Rejection over Zerbe**

Claims 23-26 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,284,264 to Zerbe et al. Applicants respectfully submit that the cancellation of claims 23-26 and 28 obviates these grounds of rejection.

**Applicants' Response to 35 U.S.C. §102 Rejection over Lin**

Claims 23-28 and 51-53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by EP 1 110 546 to Lin et al. Applicants respectfully submit that the cancellation of claims 23-28 and 51-53 obviates these grounds of rejection.

**Applicants' Response to 35 U.S.C. §102 Rejection over Chen**

Claims 23-31 and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,552,024 to Chen et al. (hereinafter "Chen"). Applicants respectfully submit that the cancellation of claims 23-31 and 51 obviates these grounds of rejection.

**Applicants' Response to 35 U.S.C. §103 Rejection over Chen in view of Dohner**

Claims 52 and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Chen in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,238,700 to Dohner et al. Applicants respectfully submit that the cancellation of claims 52 and 53 obviates these grounds of rejection.

In view of the foregoing, claims 54, 55 and 62-90 are now believed to be in proper form for allowance. A favorable reconsideration of the application on the merits is earnestly solicited.

Application No.: 10/074,272  
Amendment and Response dated October 4, 2004  
Reply to Office Action of July 2, 2004  
Docket No.: 1199-4  
Page 8

If the Examiner has any questions regarding this Response, she is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Jamie Larmann", written over a horizontal line.

Jamie M. Larmann  
Registration No. 48,623  
Attorney for Applicants

HOFFMANN & BARON, LLP  
6900 Jericho Turnpike  
Syosset, NY 11791  
(973) 331-1700